

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JOHNONNA JO KEENS,

No. 4:20-CV-02135

Plaintiff,

(Chief Judge Brann)

v.

(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)

KILOLO KIJAKAZI,¹

*Acting Commissioner of Social
Security,*

Defendant.

ORDER

MARCH 3, 2022

Johnonna Jo Keens filed this action seeking review of a decision by the Acting Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying Keens’ claim for social security disability benefits and supplemental security income.² On February 8, 2022, Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision and close this case.³ No timely objections were filed to this Report and Recommendation.

¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Kilolo Kijakazi, as the successor officer to Andrew Saul, Commissioner of Social Security, is automatically substituted as Defendant in this action.

² Docs. 1, 14.

³ Doc. 19.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.⁴ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁵ Upon review of the record, the Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Arbuckle's conclusion that the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence. Consequently, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19) is **ADOPTED**;
2. The Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**;
3. Final Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant and against Keens pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); and
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann
Chief United States District Judge

⁴ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.